Special Anti-War Issue

Exclusive Text: Morse Speech and Morse-Lehman Resolution on Quemoy-Matsu

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. III, NUMBER 12 APRIL 11, 1955 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Chance To Strike A Blow For Peace

For the first time in many months the people of this country have a way to make their voice heard for peace. This is to write their Senators and Representatives and mobilize their organizations to demand public hearings on the Morse-Lehman resolution, and its passage by Congress. If you don't want to see our country sucked into an atomic war over Quemoy and Matsu, this is your opportunity.

So far as we know no newspaper—not even the *New York Times*—has published the text of this historic resolution or of the masterly speech made by Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon in introducing it. We are printing both in this issue and also the heart of Senator Estes Kefauver's bold attack two days earlier on the war party. We believe it urgent that this material reach as wide an audience as possible, and think it a commentary on the pass to which we have come that it is left to a little publication like ours to make available texts so important for peace.

If by the time Congress readjourns after the Easter recess, there is a real kickback from the country in favor of this resolution, a brake will be applied to the appalling drift toward war. The Morse-Lehman resolution would limit the blank check given the President by the Formosan war powers resolution; it says the latter shall not be construed as authorizing military operations in defense of Quemoy and Matsu; it asks the United Nations to undertake the evacuation of the islands. The Morse-Lehman resolution would also begin to untie Chiang Kai-shek from the U. S. apron strings knotted by the Mutual Security Pact; the resolution asserts the right of the U. S. to defend Formosa but adds significantly, "until such time as its sovereign status is determined by peaceful processes."

Clearing The Way for Diplomacy

The Morse-Lehman resolution would thus accomplish two purposes. The evacuation of the offshore islands would at last make possible a tacit cease-fire on the Formosa strait. The status of Formosa would be unfrozen and the way cleared for negotiation to determine its future. Where the Administration has been trying to proceed by threatening China with atomic destruction, the Morse-Lehman resolution would put the Congress on record as directing a return to the methods of diplomacy under conditions which make it possible. This is why the war party is mobilizing to bury the resolution in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The fight for the Morse-Lehman resolution is a fight against something worse than secret diplomacy—and that is secret foreign policy legislation. With all the fuss about Yalta, no one raises a cry about the private discussions which have been going on behind the closed doors of Senator George's suite at the Mayflower, and in the White House. No one knows what is being said, what commitments are being made, what decisions are being reached—though these may literally mean a Third World War which would destroy civilization as we now know it. What FDR did at Yalta is history, but what Dulles tells George in private at the Mayflower may be our fate and destiny. This is a fight to take the shaping of foreign policy out of the hands of a few and return it to the Senate and the people.

Toward A One-Party State

The people of this country are being treated as if they were mindless idiots. They are told we must make a clear commitment to Formosa lest the enemy stumble into war, and then they are told we cannot make our intentions clear about Quemoy and Matsu because it is important to keep the enemy guessing! The Constitution says the President is to make foreign treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate, but the Senate has degenerated into the role of rubber stamp for the State Department. The weakness of the Democratic party leadership, and Senator George's gentle but almost dictatorial control of the Foreign Relations Committee has turned the Senate into a complaisant instrument, instead of the partner in policy the Constitution intended it to be. The reality of "bipartisanship" is to create a one-party state in the making of foreign policy.

In the past two months, four fateful commitments in the sphere of foreign policy have been pushed through Congress with less consideration than is often accorded local harbor improvements. The Southeast Asia Pact on February 1 and the German rearmament accords on April 1 passed the Senate as minor items of an afternoon's work. The Formosan war powers resolution and the Mutual Secret Pact with Chiang were aired only in secret hearings at which Dulles and Radford were the chief witnesses and no one was heard in opposition, though the former was the first blank check for preventive war ever signed by an American Congress. On foreign policy the Senate is beginning to act like the Supreme Soviet in Moscow where whatever the government asks is adopted by acclamation. It is this withdrawal from democratic control of the vital decisions of war and peace, of life and death for our country, that Senators Morse and Lehman are fighting on our behalf. Read what they propose. Pass it on. *And do something about it.*

* Members of this key committee, to whom you may write, are: Democrats—George (Ga.), Green (R.I.), Fulbright (Ark.), Sparkman (Ala.), Humphrey (Minn.), Mansfield (Mont.), Barkley (Ky.), and Morse (Ore.); Republicans—Wiley (Wis.), Smith (N. J.), Hickenlooper (Iowa), Langer (N. Dak.), Knowland (Calif.), Aiken (Vt.) and Capehart (Ind.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Historic Appeal for Peace and Sanity

Wayne Morse's Challenge to the Eisenhower Administration, U. S. Senate, April 1

Let me make clear my position that the foreign policy of the United States is not entirely within the province of the President of the United States, although we have reached the point where there seems to be acceptance of the notion that American foreign policy must be what the President of the United States decides it shall be. The foreign policy must always be what the American people decide it shall be. If the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States will present the facts to the American people about the Asiatic situation, the foreign policy of the United States with respect to Asia will not be the foreign policy which the President of the United States seems to be following these days.

In my opinion the President of the United States has no right to leave in suspension the question of America's position in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus. . . . In my judgment, already great damage has been done by the President of the United States to the prestige of the United States in the field of foreign policy. I believe that the President of the United States has already delayed too long making clear to the world what our position is to be in regard to our Asiatic foreign policy. In my opinion, already the President has delayed too long in making clear to the world that we are going to insist on staying within the framework of international law. We are outside it today in respect to our Asiatic policy.

What is happening around the world is that our allies are asking the question, "How can the proposed course of action of the United States in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus, in respect to which islands the United States does not have a single legal right under international law be defended?"

I have been waiting for the Secretary of State to answer a question which I put to him in the Foreign Relations Committee the other day. I asked the Secretary of State, "What principle of international law justifies the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus by the United States?" He did not name a principle of international law in justification of our position for the simple reason that he could not. In the light of the situation in Asia at the present time the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus cannot be reconciled with international law; on the contrary, in my opinion, if we defend them we would violate existing international law. We have no right to be defending these coastal islands with respect to which we have no territorial rights. That is the situation. The American people have the right to expect their President to stay within the framework of international law. He has made it perfectly clear that he does not understand the principles of international law, because if he did understand them he would not have asked the Congress of the United States for authorization to go outside the framework of international law.

Best Way to Save Face

"Mr. LONG. [D. La.] I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that it seems to me his logic is inescapable. . . . I say that the best way for us to save face over Quemoy and Matsu is not to get our face on Quemoy and Matsu."

If It Were Staten Island

"MR. KEFAUVER. [D. Tenn.] As for the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, Mr. President, I wonder how long we would sit idly by if the Chinese Communists were to hold Staten Island, which is about as far from New York City as Quemoy is from the coast of China, or if the Chinese Communists were to hold Catalina Island, which is only a few miles off the coast of California."

Preventive War Power Asked

What did he ask for? He asked for authority to strike the mainland of China before an act of war was committed against the United States. That is what the language of the resolution means. We cannot read its language in any other terms in the light of existing international law. The President sent to us a resolution which was passed by the Congress, in which the President asked for power to take "such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores." A reading of the testimony before the committee which was submitted by the Secretary of State, by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by other top Administration witnesses, discloses that there is no question about what they seek to do. They seek authority to exercise the discretionary right to determine when we shall strike the mainland of China before an act of war has been committed against the United States. When we follow that course of action we walk outside the framework of international law. That is where the United States stands today, in the judgment of the world.

That is why Canada, France and Great Britain are making it perfectly clear to us that they will not support us in the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus. They have no intention of supporting the United States in an aggressive course of action with respect to Quemoy and the Matsus, over which territory we have not a scintilla of legal right.

Of course, I am perfectly aware of the fact that these days when one makes the fight for peace which I am making in these arguments in the Senate and elsewhere in the country, he is likely to be called an appeaser, a follower of Chamberlain or even a follower of the Communist line.

History Will Condemn Us

Mr. President, the judgment of history against the United States will be a sad one if America continues much longer to follow the foreign policy of Dwight D. Eisenhower. The time has come for the American people, in the interest of the tens of thousands of American boys who are likely to die if we continue to act outside the framework of international law, to make clear to the President of the United States that they do not want to defend Quemoy and the Matsus, over which we have no international legal rights.

I think the issue is that simple. I am perfectly willing, in this historic debate across the country in the weeks and months ahead—God giving us weeks and months of peace—to take this issue to the American people, because I am satisfied that an overwhelming majority of them disapprove of the President's request for authorization to strike the mainland of China before an act of war has been committed against us.

The Right to Know the Facts

I think it is very important that the American people make clear to the President of the United States at the earliest possible date the great groundswell of opposition to his proposal embodied in the resolution, that we should follow an aggressive course of action on the mainland of China or in defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, if he decides that such a course is necessary. It is about time for the American people to make some decisions about American foreign policy. They cannot decide intelligently and accurately unless we in the Congress see to it that they have the facts about American foreign policy in Asia.

The delightful social luncheon engagements at the White House with leaders of the Congress, in which we are given

It Is Important To Get This Speech Into As Many Hands As Possible

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very little information, do not result in the American people getting the facts. I think the situation adds up to a policy of maintaining the status quo. The American people are not given the facts to which they are entitled. They are entitled to know from the President of the United States the answer to this question, "Why do you not tell us why you will or will not defend Quemoy and the Matsus?" The people of the United States are entitled to an answer to that question in the first instance, and our allies are entitled to it in the second instance.

Formosa, But Not the Offshore Isles

Before coming to the resolution which I intend to submit I wish to make it clear again that there is no one in the Senate or in the country more determined than I am to defend Formosa to the hilt, because we have the legal right and duty to defend Formosa. When we are defending Formosa we are within the framework of international law, not outside it,* as we are with respect to Quemoy and the Matsus. When we defend Formosa we are defending the peace in the Pacific. When we defend Formosa we are doing what we are clearly obligated to do, in my judgment, under the Japanese treaty, until the sovereignty of Formosa is determined by the judicial processes of the United Nations.

What the American people need to have told to them very clearly is that under the Japanese treaty Formosa's sovereignty was not determined. What the Japanese treaty did was release, as far as Japan is concerned, any claim Japan had over Formosa. However, the sovereignty of Formosa was never vested in Chiang Kai-shek.

That is why while I was opposing the [Mutual Security] treaty [with Chiang], I tried to write into it a reservation which would make very clear that the treaty could not possibly be interpreted by anyone as strengthening Chiang's claim to any sovereign rights over Formosa. With regard to the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin [McCarthy], I wish to say that the American people are entitled to assurance from the President that American boys will not be called upon to die in China in defense of Chiang on Quemoy and the Matsus.

China's Civil War Not Ours

The American people know that Chiang's civil war in China is not a matter in which we should become embroiled. Further, with regard to the social conferences with congressional leaders at the White House on yesterday, and the day before yesterday, it needs to be said that the vacuity of information that came out of these luncheon conferences was not reassurring to the American people. The public is now entitled to know from both the President and the congressional leaders what our policy is going to be in respect to Quemoy and the Matsus.

I am opposed to the President of the United States dragging us into the China civil war through any attempt to defend Quemoy and the Matsus. Therefore, I submit to the Senate and ask to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the committee hold early hearings on it, a concurrent resolution. I submit it on behalf of myself and on behalf of that great statesman from the State of New York, and my beloved friend, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman]. The resolution reads as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 21

Whereas it is the historic policy of the United States to promote peace throughout the world by urging the settlement of international disputes through juridical processes; and

Whereas the United States has always decried the use of aggression or threats of aggression in foreign affairs; and

Whereas there is now danger of United States involvement in atomic war with the Chinese Communists in defense of the Matsu and Quemoy islands occupied by forces of the Republic of China; and

Whereas the United States under international law has no territorial rights or claims to the Matsu and Quemoy islands; and

* Neither the Senator nor General MacArthur were so sure about our right to hold Formosa four years ago. During the MacArthur inquiry, this exchange took place between them (p.187):

Senator MORSE. One other question on Formosa . . . if we come to a system of international justice through law, we will then be confronted possibly with the Formosa issue before the World Court . . . I am afraid if we got to the World Court now, on just the one issue as to whether the Cairo agreement, as a matter of international law, it might obligate us to give it up. That might be pretty difficult for us to win as a legal proposition . . . we are on there now on unilateral action because we believe it is necessary to protect it from falling into Red hands in order to protect our security and interests.

General MacARTHUR. Right.

Kefauver's Warning Against A War Party in The Administration

"Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Congress has written a blank check for the President in dealing with the Formosa situation. It was done at his request and principally to demonstrate the unity of the nation. But the fact that the Formosa resolution exists places a burden and responsibility on the President of the United States which I expect he will one day regret he has. There are forces in his administration so powerful and apparently so eager for a war with China that they are becoming almost impossible to resist. That the United States should be plunged into a war over Quemoy and Matsu ought to be unthinkable. Yet there are those in the present administration who are plotting and planning to bring such a war about, whatever the risks involved. . . .

"These plotters tell us that we can fight a limited war with China without risk. They tell us that we can fight a limited war with precision atomic bombing and get away with it. There is one school which wants to blast and destroy China's industrial capacity. There is another, and apparently more official school, which merely wants to use atomic weapons against China's airfields.

"In either case we are told that Russia will not come to the aid of her ally China because of fear of massive retaliation herself. . . . If Russia stood idly by while we destroyed the industry of China or even her air force, it would mean the end of her hold on all her satellites. . . .

"It is said that Russia does not now have the means of delivering atomic or hydrogen bombs on this continent, and that she would thus be paralyed by fear of bombs that Russia knows we are now capable of delivering. I do not know that Russia cannot deliver bombs on this continent, and I doubt that anyone else knows other than the Russians. But if Russia cannot deliver bombs on this continent, there are plenty of places vital to our interests and the future of humanity where she is perfectly capable of delivering the bombs we know she possesses. . . .

"Mr. President, although the President may not seem to be rocking the boat, the tragic fact is that in his administration American foreign military policy has degenerated into rule by fear. The tremendous good will toward our Nation and our people which was ours at the end of World War II has been dissipated into the mists of history. Nobody in the State Department or the Pentagon ever talks any more about good will or neighborliness. Instead, they rattle their atomic bombs. These days one hears coming from the State Department, not the cooing of the doves of peace, but the sharp click when someone cocks a hydrogen bomb.

"It is time we started talking, for a change, about peace. We should put in a deep, dark closet all of Secretary Dulles' bellicosity."

—Senator Kefauver (D. Tenn.), to an almost empty Senate Chamber Wednesday evening March 30 (Congr. Rec. that date 3464-5).

Help Widen Its Distribution Through Organizations and Otherwise

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whereas a military defense of said islands by the United States subjects the United States to the charge of acts of aggression and involvement in a Chinese civil war; and

Whereas the major allies of the United States have declared that they are unsympathetic to and would not support the defense of the Matsu and Quemoy islands; and

Whereas it is the right and policy of the United States under international law to defend Formosa and the Pescadores against communistic attack until such time as its sovereign status is determined by peaceful processes: Therefore be it

***Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that—**

(a) the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area," approved January 29, 1955 (Public Law 4, 84th Cong.), shall not be construed to authorize the President to employ any of the Armed Forces of the United States in military operations concerning the Matsu and Quemoy islands;

(b) the existing danger of war could be relieved by the cooperation of the Republic of China in the evacuation of such islands and the safe return of the forces of the Republic of China and the civilian inhabitants to Formosa;

(c) on the basis of such cooperation the President at the earliest practicable time should take appropriate action to lay before the United Nations the danger to the peace of the world presented by the threat of attack upon such islands, with the request that the United Nations undertake the supervision of such evacuation and the removal from those islands of the Republic of China and the civilian inhabitants who may desire to seek refuge elsewhere; and

(d) the Armed Forces of the United States properly may be employed to render assistance which may be required to safeguard such evacuation and removal under such conditions as the United Nations may determine to be necessary to avoid, to the greatest practicable extent, involvement in hostilities with forces of the Chinese Communists.

Mr. President, let me say that by adopting such a concurrent resolution we would stay within the framework of international law. Moreover, we would return to the historic foreign policy of the United States, a foreign policy which has always made clear to the world that we do not follow a course of aggression or a course of threatened aggression, and that we have never claimed to exercise jurisdiction over territories to which we have no international law rights.

In the interest of the judgment that will rest on the heads of future generations of American citizens, we had better go back to—and the President of the United States has the duty to the American people to lead us back into—the framework of international law, out of which he led us when he sent to Congress in the first place the joint resolution that sought to give him extraordinary and, in my opinion, unconstitutional powers.

Public Opinion Has Shifted

In the days that have passed since the historic debate on that joint resolution, a very interesting shift has been taking place in American public opinion. Those of us who dared to stand on the floor of the Senate and speak in behalf of the thesis I am reiterating today, expected to be castigated, and we have been castigated. But, Mr. President, a great change is taking place in American public opinion, and we are beginning to observe a growing evidence of it in American journalism.

Mr. President, I refer to the *New York Times*, which is certainly not an anti-Eisenhower newspaper. It is a newspaper which I say respectfully has, in my opinion, been trying to rationalize and alibi the President's mistakes ever since it made the mistake of supporting President Eisenhower in 1952.

Even the Philippines

"Mr. HUMPHREY [D. Minn.] The Senator from Oregon is right. When we cannot get the Canadians to support our policy, then our policy deserves some reexamination. When we cannot find allies anywhere in the world save Dr. Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek who will support us, then we are in trouble.

"I think it is interesting to observe that the Secretary of State, returning from Bangkok, could not deliver to the government or to the Senate assurances that even the Philippines would be with us."

What do we read these days on the editorial pages of the *New York Times* with regard to the Quemoy and Matsu situation? I read from the editorial, "Burning Daylight in Asia," published in the *New York Times* of Sunday, March 27, 1955. The editorial quotes the statement of the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. George] about time passing and about our burning daylight in Asia. In the course of the editorial the *New York Times* had this to say:

Mr. Reston gives this interpretation of the opinions of some other Senators who have not spoken out: "We are drifting into a war over Matsu and Quemoy. The Administration is reconciling itself to the idea that this issue now rests not with Washington but with Peiping." So we have as today's news describes it, a situation in which a certain kind of logic—the logic, perhaps, of death and widespread destruction—goes from the defense of Quemoy and Matsu to an all-out atomic attack on the industrial potential of Communist China. What this logic means in cost of human life and perhaps in a vast destruction of cities far outside China, the citizen may ponder.

A Change In Tone

The tone of that editorial in the *New York Times* is quite different from that of the editorials the *Times* published when the joint resolution was before the Senate.

Mr. President, one of the arguments made by those of us who opposed the joint resolution, and who are now, in the debate across the country, opposing the President's Asia policy, is that there is no real danger that the Communists can take Formosa. With more than a hundred miles of open blue water between Formosa and the mainland, with the military power we have in the Western Pacific, there is no real danger that the Communists can take Formosa.

I happen to have more confidence in our military might than apparently have the preventive war advocates in this country who would like to get us into war with China. They seem to think that our military cannot hold Formosa unless we defend Quemoy and the Matsus and in fact strike military installations in China. It is the position of the experts that there is no real danger that the Communists can take Formosa, but there is a great danger that we can get into a terrible, bloody war over Quemoy and the Matsus, to which we have no legal right. There is no justification for our joining Chiang in a civil war on Quemoy and Matsus in order to protect Formosa. The "face-saving" argument is an unsound one.

Formosans Couldn't Care Less

Tucked inside last Sunday's (April 2) New York Daily News was a dispatch from its own correspondent, John O'Kearney, on Formosa, headlined "Believe Chiang Fate Hinges on Offshore Islands." The main theme was "growing resentment" over American "vacillation" but one paragraph provided this glimpse of realities:

"Politically informed Chinese sources who are unquestionably anti-Red believe, however, that four-fifths of the Formosan population would not care much one way or another about Quemoy or Matsu."

Bundle Orders of 50 or More Available at 5 Cents Each; 500 or More at 3 Cents Each

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saving Lives More Important

Since when in American history has the United States of America been worrying about "saving face"? Since when have we adopted that Oriental psychological trait? I say, Mr. President, we had better pay more attention to the saving of the lives of American boys than to saving face. We had better pay more attention to the risks of war than to the risks of peace. If we permit the ruthless police dictator of Communist China to suck us into a war on the mainland of China, we shall have to kill millions of Chinese. I think that if that is done, the judgment of history will be that we are the aggressor in the situation, and as a result of that course of action, we will lose China for hundreds of years to come. Now is the time, before it is too late and while there is still an opportunity, for the United States to rededicate itself to the international law principles which have always characterized our foreign policy.

On this point, Mr. President, one of the reasons I am such a strong advocate of the Paris Accord Treaty before the Senate for ratification today is that it is an example of freemen standing together within the boundaries of international law to meet the threat of Russian communism in Europe. It is another example of freemen joining forces within the international legal rights of each of the nations involved as a protectorate of freemen against the Russian threat of communism.

Why did I support as strongly as I did the SEATO treaties? Because those treaties took the form of the nations of Southeast Asia, again within their sovereign rights, joining forces against the threat of communism. Those treaties involve in no way the invasion of territorial sovereign rights of other nations. They in no way invoive the United States making territorial claims over territory to which it has no legal right.

Inadequate Information

This is, in part, the issue which must be drawn in the debate over Quemoy and Matsus that will, in my judgment be waged in the next few weeks across this country. I am willing to say on the floor today, having just gone across the country that I am deeply convinced that the great rank and file of the American people, even on the basis of the inadequate facts which have been made available to them by the administration, are not in favor of what they already know about President Eisenhower's foreign policy with respect to Asia.

Mr. President, there are other editorials which support the thesis I am advancing here today. I wish to invite attention to a second *New York Times* editorial of March 31, 1955. I wish to read two paragraphs from the editorial:

But free world unity is jeopardized today by growing division and confusion regarding a subsidiary problem of our Far Eastern policy, involving the question of whether we shall or shall not defend the Chinese offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. There is no longer any question that we shall defend, as we are pledged by treaty to defend, both Formosa and the Pescadores and that we shall do so with all the means at our disposal. In this policy we have won increasing support from all free nations. But these free nations, including our European allies and neighboring Canada, draw a clear line of distinction between Formosa and the Pescadores, on the one hand, and the offshore islands on the other. They not only decline to support our equivocal stand on the latter but definitely reject any idea of joining in their defense.

Why They Leaked The Yalta Papers

"Another factor which influenced the timing of the publication was that it was certain that German and French ratification of the Paris accords would lead to more intensive consideration of another conference with the Russians. It was obvious that the full story of Yalta illuminates graphically the dangers, as well as the possible values, of such talks; the need of adequate prior preparations, and the importance of a clear definition of principles which will not be sacrificed to secure agreement. These are the considerations which led the Department to make the publication."

—Letter by Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton replying to a letter from Senator Humphrey to Secretary Dulles asking him to explain why and how the Yalta papers were "leaked" at this time. (Congr. Rec. April 1, p. 3587.)

Elsewhere in this editorial the *Times* said:

In these circumstances it is high time to review our policy regarding these islands and clarify our position beyond any doubt or misrepresentation.

I digress from the editorial long enough to say that such is the purpose of my resolution. Its purpose is to give the Congress of the United States and the administration another opportunity to reexamine and clarify their positions regarding Asia. Such a reexamination is sorely needed, because American policy in Asia, if it is not clarified and if we move into a defense of Quemoy and the Matsus, will leave us, I fear, in a position where we will stand alone in Asia, because the action itself will convict us of aggression in Asia.

Elsewhere in this editorial the writer says:

This would be strictly in line with our treaty obligations, which do not extend to the offshore islands. It would preserve Western unity and assure us the moral support of the free world. It would demonstrate our willingness to preserve peace by putting a hundred miles of blue water between Formosa and the mainland.

"Atomic War Over Matsu?"

Likewise, Mr. President, there is a rather interesting editorial in the *Washington Post and Times Herald*, a news-

If This Is the First Time You Have Seen a Copy of This Weekly—

A word of introduction may be in order. It is edited and published by I. F. Stone, formerly Washington editor of *PM* and the *Nation*, author of "The Hidden History of the Korean War," "Underground to Palestine" and many other well-known works. Its purpose is to provide independent and militant coverage of the capital without those concessions to hate-breeding cold war stereotypes which have become necessary in American journalism generally. It is based on a belief in the necessity of peace and the indivisibility of civil liberties. As in this issue, it tries to present material inadequately covered, if at all, by the press. It is now in its third successful year of publication. It is published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays in August and December at 301 E. Capitol Street, Washington 3, D.C. The domestic subscription rate is $5 a year; $6 elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere; $10 by first-class mail everywhere else in the world. Air mail is $15 to Europe and $20 to Asia and Africa. You will find it an indispensable source of information not to be found elsewhere, and of a point of view in defense of peace and civil liberty few are any longer willing to express.

Use the Blank on Page Six to Subscribe Now

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paper which seems to have blown hot and cold on this subject. Its most recent editorial contribution on this subject is headed "Atomic War Over Matsu?" Mr. President, the editorial says, in part:

> Thus is the deadly prospect of nuclear war raised over a couple of tiny and in themselves insignificant island groups on the doorstep of Communist China.
>
> This possibility of involvement over the Quemoys and Matsus has caused increasing concern among our allies. The British have made known their intention not to join in a war over the coastal islands; and last week the Canadian Foreign Minister said much the same thing. These protests evidently are aimed at dissuading the administration from what other governments consider a rash course; our allies know that if a major war should develop from a clash over the Matsus, the question of cause would become academic and they would inevitably be drawn in. The fact remains that despite a large measure of support for the American pledge to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, most of the free world simply does not believe that the Matsus and Quemoys are worth a war.

Evacuation of the Islands Asked

Mr. President. I wish to say that, in my judgment, the immediate course of action which should be followed is that we reveal to the world our determination to stay within our international legal rights which automatically will bring to an end even the suggestion that we shall defend a few square miles of rocky land off the coast of the mainland of China over which we have no international law rights. My resolution provides that we shall proceed at once to use our good offices and juridicial processes in connection with the evacuation of Quemoy and the Matsus if Chiang wishes to cooperate. But if he does not, then the answer must be: "You stay there alone. We will not endanger American boys in the defense of the Nationalist Chinese on Quemoy and the Matsus. We will give you coverage, if you want it, with the cooperation of the United Nations, to return to Formosa, because we have a legal right to defend Formosa."

Then I think we must make it very clear to the Communist segment of the world that we stand ready, in cooperation with our Allied friends, to discuss with their top leaders the present danger of war; and once again take the rules of reason to the issues of peace and war, and demonstrate that it is the United States and our allies who are seeking peace.

"We Are In the Wrong"

We shall not maintain among the allies the unity which is so essential in the struggle to maintain peace if we follow a course of action in Asia which our allies cannot support. If we look at the record in respect to Quemoy and the Matsus I think we must acknowledge we are wrong; because I think we are making threats of aggression in Asia today in respect to these islands and in respect to the possibility of the President authorizing a strike against military installations on the mainland of China before an act of aggression has been committed against the United States.

The time has come when the President of the United States has no moral right to remain ambiguous any longer with the American people about Quemoy and the Matsus. The American people are the ones who will do the dying and they have the right to say to the President, as I think they are calling out by the millions today, "Mr. President, what is your policy in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus? Are we or are we not going to defend them? What justification can you give for our dying in their defense if you should decide to defend them?"

If the answer of the President is that his policy is to defend them, I think the overwhelming majority of the American people will make it very clear to him, in the exercise of the American democratic processes, that he is not their leader.

Inside Red China

Nation's Business, the organ of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, in its April issue carries a summary of an Air Force survey of Communist China. This is one of those mammoth jobs of scholarship-for-war being financed by the military. This one was begun in 1951 and had produced 20 reports totalling 2500 pages when it was abandoned, only two thirds completed. Two questions-and-answers in the Chamber of Commerce summary may indicate why the Air Force decided to spend no more money on it:

"Has China's new position of power and influence aroused national pride?

"Yes. The success of Chinese soldiers in forcing back UN forces in Korea appears to have done more than any other single thing in China to gain support for the Communists' programs. The people are proud of a winner.

"What is the likelihood that the Red regime will collapse, or that the people will revolt?

"No evidence was found of any group with power enough to overthrow the regime in any considerable region."

A Wider Audience for the Weekly Is A Wider Audience for Peace — Send A Gift Sub Now

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name_____

Street_____

City_____ Zone____ State____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name_____

Street_____

City_____ Zone____ State____

* $1 extra for Canada. 4/11/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

50,000 Copies of This Issue Are Being Printed—More Than 40,000 Were Sold by Press Time—Order At Once for the Next Run

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED